arXiv:1603.07710v1 [math.GT] 24 Mar 2016

OBSTRUCTING PSEUDOCONVEX EMBEDDINGS AND CONTRACTIBLE STEIN FILLINGS FOR BRIESKORN SPHERES

THOMAS E. MARK AND BÜLENT TOSUN

ABSTRACT. A conjecture due to Gompf asserts that no nontrivial Brieskorn homology sphere admits a pseudoconvex embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$, with either orientation. We verify this conjecture for a family of Brieskorn spheres that satisfy certain necessary conditions, namely admitting a smooth embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and supporting a Stein fillable contact structure in the correct homotopy class. The proof also provides examples of contractible 4-manifolds X whose boundary is Stein fillable with both orientations, but such that X admits no Stein structure with either orientation.

1. INTRODUCTION

A Stein manifold is a complex manifold admitting a proper Morse function that is bounded below and strictly plurisubharmonic. By a compact Stein manifold, or *Stein domain*, we mean a sub-level set corresponding to a regular value of such a function. Smooth manifolds supporting a Stein structure were characterized in terms of their handle structure by Eliashberg [6], with some refinements in the case of Stein surfaces due to Gompf [17]. Since that time, Stein structures have been shown to exhibit a remarkable degree of flexibility in certain senses, yet their geometric structure also imposes enough rigidity to allow classification results in other cases. An instance of flexibility is given by Gompf in [18], in which it is shown that a codimension-0 submanifold U of a complex surface is isotopic to a Stein subsurface if and only if the induced complex structure is homotopic through almost-complex structures to a Stein structure on U. Using this result, Gompf exhibits a variety of interesting examples of Stein manifolds in $\mathbb{C}^2$ including domains of holomorphy that are diffeomorphic to non-standard smooth structures on $\mathbb{R}^4$, and contractible Stein domains with non-simply-connected boundary.

In particular, Gompf finds many examples of hyperbolic integer homology 3-spheres that embed in $\mathbb{C}^2$ as the level set of an exhausting plurisubharmonic function, and thus as the boundary of a Stein domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$. We refer to such an embedding of a 3-manifold as a *pseudoconvex embedding*. On the other hand, Gompf makes the following bold conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. [18] No Brieskorn integer homology sphere Σ (other than S^3) admits a pseudoconvex embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$, with either orientation.

As Gompf points out, many Brieskorn spheres do not embed even smoothly in $\mathbb{C}^2$. This paper provides the first verification of Conjecture 1.1 in some cases where Σ does have a smooth embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and also satisfies certain other obvious contact geometric constraints we describe below.

A question closely related to the existence of pseudoconvex embeddings has been raised in contact- and symplectic-geometric circles:

Question 1.2. Does every compact contractible 4-manifold with Stein fillable boundary admit a Stein structure?

See, for example, Yasui [29], where the connection between this question—specialized to the case that the boundary is the 3-sphere—and the smooth 4-dimensional Poincaré conjecture is described. The results below show that the answer to Question 1.2 is negative in general.

A relation between Question 1.2 and Conjecture 1.1 is as follows. First note that if a contractible 4-manifold X admits a handle decomposition with a single 1-handle, a single 2-handle, and no 3- or 4-handles, then X embeds smoothly in $\mathbb{C}^2$ (the same is true if there are more 1- and 2-handles, as long as the corresponding presentation of the fundamental group is Andrews-Curtis trivial; see [18, Example 3.2]). If such a contractible manifold admits a Stein structure, then using Gompf's isotopy result above, it follows that X is diffeomorphic to a Stein domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and in particular its boundary admits a pseudoconvex embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Conversely, if a 3-manifold has a pseudoconvex embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$, then it is clearly the boundary of an acyclic Stein manifold (for the orientation question, see [18, Proposition 7.4]).

We consider these issues in the context of the family of Brieskorn spheres $\Sigma(2,3,6m\pm1)$. For many members of this ubiquitous family, Gompf's conjecture 1.1 can be answered affirmatively by purely topological means. We have:

- For odd m, both $\Sigma(2,3,6m-1)$ and $\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$ have nontrivial Rohlin invariant, hence neither bounds an acyclic 4-manifold. In particular these manifolds do not admit even a smooth embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$.
- For even n, the Brieskorn sphere $\Sigma(2,3,6m-1)$ has $R=1$, where R is the invariant of Fintushel-Stern. By Theorem 1.1 of [11], it follows that none of these manifolds bound acyclic either.

This leaves the family $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$, for which no standard invariants (e.g., Rohlin or $\bar{\mu}$, Fintushel-Stern's R, the Heegaard-Floer d-invariant, or Manolescu's lift β of the Rohlin invariant [21]) obstruct an acyclic filling. In fact it is known by work of Akbulut-Kirby [1] and Casson-Harer [2] in the case $n=1$, and Fickle [10] when $n=2$, that both $\Sigma(2,3,13)$ and $\Sigma(2,3,25)$ are the boundaries of smooth contractible 4-manifolds of "Mazur type," meaning each has a handle decomposition with one 1-handle and one 2-handle. In particular, both of these admit smooth embeddings in $\mathbb{C}^2$. For $n\geq 3$, neither an acyclic 4-manifold bounding $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ nor an embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$ appear to be known, but it seems plausible that both exist.

The main result of this paper is the following, where we write $-X$ for the manifold X after reversing its orientation.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose X is a smooth compact oriented acyclic 4-manifold whose boundary is the Brieskorn sphere $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$, for some $n\geq 1$. Then neither X nor $-X$ admits a symplectic structure weakly filling a contact structure on its boundary.*

Note that $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$, with either orientation, does admit Stein fillings (and with one orientation supports Stein fillable contact structures having $\theta=-2$: see below). However,

since a Stein structure provides a weak symplectic filling of the induced contact structure on the boundary, Theorem 1.3 together with the constructions of Akbulut-Kirby, Casson-Harer, and Fickle, proves the following, which gives a negative answer to Question 1.2:

Corollary 1.4. *No acyclic 4-manifold with boundary $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ admits a Stein structure, with either orientation. In particular, there exist contractible, boundary-irreducible 4-manifolds that do not admit Stein structures with either orientation.*

As perhaps the first substantial evidence for Conjecture 1.1, we have:

Corollary 1.5. *No member of the family $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ admits a pseudoconvex embedding in $\mathbb{C}^2$, with either orientation.*

A Stein domain induces a natural contact structure on its boundary as the field of complex tangencies. The homotopy class of an oriented tangent 2-plane field ξ on a homology sphere Y is determined by an invariant $\theta(\xi) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ defined by

$$\theta(\xi) = c_1^2(X,J) - 3\sigma(X) - 2\chi(X),$$

for any almost-complex 4-manifold (X,J) with $\partial X = Y$ and such that ξ is the field of complex tangencies $TY \cap J(TY)$. Here $\chi(X)$ is the Euler characteristic and $\sigma(X)$ is the signature of the cup product pairing on $H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$. Thus, if (Y,ξ) is the contact boundary of an acyclic Stein manifold (X,J), then necessarily $\theta(\xi) = -2$. The same conclusion holds if (Y,ξ) is weakly symplectically filled by an acyclic manifold (X,ω), since we can select an almost-complex structure compatible with both ω and ξ.

This elementary observation means that with sufficient knowledge of the contact structures on Y, it is sometimes possible to rule out acyclic Stein fillings via homotopy considerations. Indeed, this method works for the manifold $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ with the opposite of its usual orientation (the usual orientation being as the link of a complex singularity):

Theorem 1.6. [28] *For any $m \geq 1$, the Brieskorn manifold $-\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$ admits exactly $\frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$ tight contact structures up to isotopy. All these contact structures are homotopic and have $\theta = 2$; at least m of them are Stein fillable.*

The proof, given by the second author in [28], follows from an adaptation of a beautiful argument due to Ghiggini and Van Horn-Morris [15] who prove an analogous result for the manifolds $-\Sigma(2,3,6m-1)$. Taking $m = 2n$, Theorem 1.6 implies half of Theorem 1.3, because any (weakly) fillable contact structure is tight, and since none of the tight contact structures have $\theta = -2$, none are filled by an acyclic symplectic manifold.

With its natural orientation, the classification of tight contact structures on $\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$ is simpler:

Theorem 1.7. *For any $m \geq 1$, the Brieskorn sphere $\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$ admits exactly two tight contact structures up to isotopy. Both are Stein fillable, and both have $\theta = -2$; in fact the two contact structures are contactomorphic.*

Theorem 1.7 is proved by standard techniques in contact topology; an outline of the argument is in Section 2. Thus, though the classification of contact structures is simple with this orientation, the homotopy obstruction does not rule out acyclic fillings this case. Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 3.

Other remarks and examples. The link of a normal complex surface singularity—for example a Brieskorn manifold—admits a natural contact structure known as the *Milnor fillable* contact structure [3]. Analytic smoothings of the singularity give rise to Stein fillings of this contact structure, and following Némethi and Popescu-Pampu (c.f. [22, Section 1.3]) it is natural to ask whether this construction produces *all* Stein fillings of the Milnor fillable contact structure. This correspondence was shown to hold for cyclic quotient singularities in [22], and extended to all quotient singularities by Park–Park–Shin–Urzúa in [27]. The singularity corresponding to $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ is not rational, and hence does not admit an acyclic smoothing; the results above show that a Stein filling of $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ cannot be acyclic either.

With regard to Gompf's conjecture on pseudoconvex embeddings of Brieskorn homology spheres, our methods do not extend easily to other known families of Brieskorn spheres that embed smoothly in $\mathbb{C}^2$ (the particular difficulty is the classification of tight contact structures on these manifolds). However, if we consider the broader class of Seifert fibered rational homology spheres, then classification results due to various authors [28, 13] rule out the existence of Stein structures on several infinite families of rational homology balls, at least with one orientation. For example, the Seifert manifold $M(-2,\frac{1}{p},\frac{p-1}{p},\frac{p-1}{p})$ bounds a rational homology ball X_p by work of Casson-Harer [2], and supports Stein fillable contact structures. Since none of these structures have $\theta = -2$, however, it follows that X_p cannot be Stein (with the given orientation). One can then obtain rational homology balls that are not Stein with either orientation, by forming a boundary connected sum of X_p with $-X_p$ and appealing to a decomposition theorem for Stein fillings due to Eliashberg [5]. However, if one is given a rational homology ball with irreducible boundary and wishes to rule out Stein structures with either orientation, one must understand contact structures on the boundary with either orientation. So far the authors have not found an example of an irreducible rational homology sphere for which the obstruction arising from θ suffices to exclude Stein rational homology ball fillings with both orientations.

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to thank Bob Gompf for reminding us of his conjecture in [18]. While this paper was in preparation, the authors learned that Alex Moody has found an argument that, together with the classification results Theorem 1.6 and 1.7, provides an alternative proof of Corollary 1.5. We thank Alex Moody for interesting conversations. The first author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1309212. The second author was supported in part by an AMS-Simons travel grant.

2. Contact structures on $\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$

Here we describe the arguments leading to the classification result Theorem 1.7 for contact structures on the Brieskorn manifolds we are considering. We consider the standard orientation of $\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$, i.e., the manifold is oriented as the link of the complex surface singularity $x^2+y^3+z^{6m+1}=0$. The link is a Seifert fibered space over the 2-sphere, with three singular fibers having multiplicities 2, 3, and $6m+1$. From this one can obtain a surgery description for $\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$ as follows. First one determines integers r,s,t such that

$$3(6m+1)r+2(6m+1)s+2\cdot 3t=1,$$

for example $r = 1$, $s = -1$ and $t = -m$. Then $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m + 1)$ is described by performing surgery on a zero-framed unknot in S^3, as well as on three meridians with coefficients $2/r$, $3/s$, and $(6m + 1)/t$ (see Figure 1).



FIGURE 1. Surgery description of $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m + 1)$.

Lemma 2.1. *For $m \geq 1$, the manifold $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m + 1)$ supports two non-isotopic, Stein fillable contact structures that are contactomorphic and have $\theta = -2$.*

Proof. Perform a left Rolfsen twist on the 2-framed meridian in Figure 1, so the coefficient on that component becomes -2 while the 0-framed circle now gets framing -1. Now we can perform three successive blowdowns (handleslides and deletions of -1 framed unknots) to obtain the right hand side of Figure 1, which exhibits $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m + 1)$ as the result of $-1/m$ surgery on the right trefoil. To produce a Stein manifold with boundary $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m+1)$, we realize the right trefoil in the standard way as a Legendrian in S^3 having Thurston-Bennequin invariant $+1$, so that the desired framing is $-\frac{m+1}{m}$ with respect to the contact framing. There is a standard way to describe a rational contact surgery by a contact surgery along a Legendrian link with all framings ± 1 due to Ding-Geiges-Stipsicz [4]; in this case the algorithm describes $-\frac{m+1}{m}$ surgery as Legendrian surgery on the link given by m parallel copies of a once-stabilized right trefoil (see Figure 2). The two diagrams on the right of Figure 2 arise from the two choices for the stabilization; there is an obvious contactomorphism relating the resulting contact structures, induced by revolution around a vertical axis.

Since all surgeries have contact coefficient -1, the same diagrams describe Stein 2-handlebodies filling contact structures on $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m + 1)$, and the Chern classes of the corresponding Stein structures evaluate on the handles corresponding to the Legendrians in the diagram as the rotation number (after fixing orientations for the Legendrians). The two Chern classes obviously differ by a sign, and by [20, Theorem 1.2] must induce non-isotopic contact structures on the boundary.

One easily calculates that for each of the two Stein structures just described the Chern class has square -2, and the claimed value for θ is then immediate. □

Having exhibited two Stein fillable (and in particular, tight) contact structures on $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m+1)$, the next result completes the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Proposition 2.2. *The Brieskorn manifold $\Sigma(2, 3, 6m + 1)$ admits at most two tight contact structures.*



FIGURE 2. Two contactomorphic but not isotopic Stein fillable contact structures on $\Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$. The surgery coefficients are measured with respect to the contact framing; in each diagram on the right there are m parallel pushoffs of the stabilized trefoil.

Proof. The proof is presented assuming the reader is familiar with Giroux's convex surface theory [16] and Honda's bypass technology [19]. The argument parallels the one carried out in Ghiggini-Schönenberger [14], and the reader is referred to that work for an excellent exposition.

We first specify our framing convention. The manifold $M = \Sigma(2,3,6m+1)$ is, as explained above, a Seifert fibered space over S^2 with three singular fibers F_i, $i = 1,2,3$. Let $V_i \cong D^2 \times S^1$ denote a solid torus neighborhood of F_i, and identify $\partial V_i \cong \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $(1,0)^T$ is the direction of the meridian. We have $M \setminus V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3 \cong \Sigma \times S^1$ where Σ is a pair of pants, and we choose an identification $-\partial(M \setminus V_i) \cong \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $(0,1)^T$ is the direction of the S^1 fiber and $(1,0)^T$ is the direction given by $-\partial(pt. \times \Sigma)$. We then obtain M as $M \cong (\Sigma \times S^1) \cup_{(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3)} (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)$ where the attaching maps $A_i = \partial V_i \to -\partial(\Sigma \times S^1)_i$ are given by

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 6m+1 & 6m-5 \\ -m & -m+1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If M is equipped with a contact structure, after isotopy we can make each singular fiber F_i Legendrian and take V_i to be its standard neighborhood, with $\text{slope}(\Gamma_{\partial V_i}) = \frac{1}{n_i}$ for some $n_i < 0$. Here $\Gamma_{\partial V_i}$ indicates the dividing set on the torus ∂V_i, after a perturbation to make ∂V_i convex, and "slope" refers to the trivialization described above. Thus the

slope $1/n_i$ on ∂V_i corresponds to the vector $(n_i, 1)^T$. By Giroux's flexibility theorem [16], we can isotope V_i so that the ruling curves on $-\partial(M \setminus V_i)$ have infinite slope: we will call such curves *vertical* curves. (Note that the trivialization to be used on the torus is implicit in the notation $-\partial(M \setminus V_i)$, instead of ∂V_i.) In the following we often consider annuli with Legendrian boundary along the vertical curves on $-\partial(M \setminus V_i)$ and $-\partial(M \setminus V_j)$ for $i \neq j = 1, 2, 3$. Such an annulus will also be called vertical.

When measured in $-\partial(M \setminus V_i)$ (that is, after applying the maps A_i to the vectors $(n_i, 1)^T$), the slopes corresponding to $1/n_i$ are

$$s_1 = \frac{n_1}{2n_1 - 1},\ s_2 = -\frac{n_2}{3n_2 + 1},\ s_3 = -\frac{mn_3 + m - 1}{(6m + 1)n_3 + 6m - 5}.$$

We now explain that by finding enough bypasses we can thicken V_i such that the twisting numbers n_i of the singular fibers can be increased to $n_1 = n_2 = -2$ and $n_3 = 0$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a vertical annulus between V_1 and V_2, which we can assume is convex. There are two cases to analyze based on the slopes of tori that $\mathcal{A}$ connects and the dividing set configuration of $\mathcal{A}$. Observe that the number of endpoints of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ on the boundary corresponding to V_i is equal to the number of intersections between the relevant boundary of $\mathcal{A}$ with the dividing set $\Gamma_{-\partial(M - V_i)}$. Since the slope of $\partial\mathcal{A}$ is infinite and the dividing set on each torus contains two components, this intersection is equal to twice the denominator of the corresponding slope s_i.

Case 1: If $2n_1 - 1 \neq 3n_2 + 1$, then the "imbalance principle" applies: the dividing set of $\mathcal{A}$ has at least one boundary parallel arc, which bounds a bypass disc. This bypass might allow an increase of the corresponding twisting number n_1 or n_2. More precisely, since the ruling slopes on ∂V_1 and ∂V_2 are 2 and -3, respectively (obtained by transferring the infinite ruling slope on $-\partial(M \setminus V_i)$ using the inverse of A_i), the Twist Number Lemma from [19, Lemma 4.4] says that a bypass found in this way allows us to increase n_1 and n_2 incrementally up to a maximum of $n_1 = 0$ and $n_2 = -1$ (so long as we remain in Case 1).

Case 2: If $2n_1 - 1 = 3n_2 + 1$ and the dividing set of A does not have any boundary parallel arc, then the dividing curves on $\mathcal{A}$ run across from $-\partial(M \setminus V_1)$ to $-\partial(M \setminus V_2)$. We can cut along $\mathcal{A}$ and round the corners to get a smooth manifold $M \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \mathcal{A})$ such that $\partial(M \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \mathcal{A}))$ is smoothly isotopic to $\partial(M \setminus V_3)$. Moreover, by the Edge Rounding Lemma from [19, Lemma 3.1] we compute its slope as

$$s(\Gamma_{\partial(M \setminus V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \mathcal{A})}) = \frac{n_1}{2n_1 - 1} - \frac{n_2}{3n_2 + 1} - \frac{1}{2n_1 - 1} = \frac{n_1 - 1}{6n_1 - 3}.$$

The corresponding slope on ∂V_3 is obtained by first reversing the sign (to account for orientation), and applying the gluing map. We get

$$s(\Gamma_{\partial V_3}) = A_3^{-1}(6n_1 - 3, -n_1 + 1)^T = \frac{-n_1 + 3m + 1}{n_1 - 3m + 2}.$$

This slope is less than -1 for all $n_1 \leq 0$ and $m \geq 1$. So, by [19, Theorem 4.16] (c.f. [9, Lemma 3.16]), for any negative n_1 we can find a convex neighborhood $V_3' \subset V_3$ of the singular fiber F_3 such that $s(\Gamma_{\partial V_3'}) = -1$. When measured with respect to $-\partial(M \setminus V_3')$, the slope becomes $-\frac{1}{6}$ which corresponds to $n_3 = -1$. We now take a vertical annulus

between V_1 and V_3', and (comparing slope denominators) observe that $|2n_1 - 1| > 6$ as long as $n_1 < -2$. Therefore by the imbalance principle, the vertical annulus will have a bypass on V_1 side, and by the Twist Number Lemma we can repeatedly attach bypasses to V_1 to increase the twisting n_1 to -2. Similarly we can increase the twisting n_2 to -2. So, slopes in the coordinates of $-\partial(M \setminus V_i)$ become $s_1 = \frac{2}{5}, s_2 = -\frac{2}{5}$ and $s_3 = -\frac{1}{6}$.

We claim that a vertical convex annulus between V_1 and V_2 will now have no boundary parallel arcs in its dividing set, if the contact structure under consideration is tight. To see this, suppose there is a bypass on one side or the other: then since each boundary of $\mathcal{A}$ contains the same number of endpoints of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ there must be a bypass on each side. Attaching these to V_1 and V_2 results in thickened convex neighborhoods that we denote with the same symbol, but which now have slopes $s_1 = s(\Gamma_{-\partial(M-V_1)}) = \frac{1}{3}$ and $s_2 = s(\Gamma_{-\partial(M-V_1)}) = -\frac{1}{2}$ (c.f. the "bypass attachment lemma," [14, Theorem 2.4] or [19, Lemma 3.15]). Since the denominator of the first slope is greater than that of the second there is necessarily another bypass on the V_1 side; attach that to find a further thickening with slope $s_1 = 0$. Now the denominator of s_2 is larger, so we can attach a bypass to V_2 and find a thickening with slope $s_2 = -1$. At this point the denominators agree again, so either there are no further bypasses or there is at least one on each side. In the latter case we can thicken again to get $s_1 = \infty$ (and $s_2 = \infty$). In particular a vertical curve (i.e., a Legendrian regular fiber) on $-\partial(M \setminus V_1)$ will have twisting 0. But by [14, Lemma 4.11] this is impossible as the maximal twisting number of any tight contact structure on a Seifert manifold $M(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, r)$ is negative, for any $r \leq \frac{1}{5}$ (here the Seifert invariants $-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, r$ are the negative reciprocals of the surgery coefficients on the meridians in the diagram of Figure 1). On the other hand, if the vertical annulus now does not carry any bypasses and $s_1 = 0$, $s_2 = -1$ then we can cut along the vertical annulus and round the edges to get a torus with slope 0. When measured with respect to ∂V_3, this slopes becomes $-\frac{m}{m-1}$. This negative quantity is less than $-\frac{6m+1}{6m-5}$ for any $m \geq 1$. Hence there exists a convex torus V_3' in V_3 with slope $-\frac{6m+1}{6m-5}$, which becomes ∞ when measured with respect to $-\partial(M \setminus V_3')$, yielding the same contradiction that there is a vertical Legendrian curve with zero twisting number.

So a vertical annulus between V_1 and V_2 cannot have boundary parallel arcs in its dividing set, and without loss of generality we can then assume $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ consists of horizontal arcs. Once again, we cut along $\mathcal{A}$ and round the corners of $(M \setminus V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \mathcal{A})$. Then as before $\partial(M \setminus V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \mathcal{A})$ is smoothly isotopic to $\partial(M \setminus V_3)$ and by the Edge Rounding Lemma has slope $\frac{2}{5} - \frac{2}{5} - \frac{1}{5} = -\frac{1}{5}$. Recall $s_1 = \frac{2}{5}$ and $s_2 = -\frac{2}{5}$ correspond to slopes $\frac{1}{n_1} = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{n_2} = -\frac{1}{2}$, respectively. In particular V_1 and V_2 are the standard neighborhoods of Legendrian representatives of the corresponding singular fibers, and hence each carries unique tight contact structure up to isotopy (convex solid tori with dividing set consisting of two curves of slope equal to the reciprocal of a negative integer carry a unique tight contact structure; for example see [8, Theorem 6.7]). On the other hand, the slope $s_3 = -\frac{1}{5}$ corresponds on ∂V_3 to slope $-\frac{m+1}{m} = [-2, \ldots, -2]$, where the notation indicates the continued fraction expansion of the slope and includes m copies of -2. It follows from the classification of tight contact structures on solid tori [19, Theorem 2.3] that V_3 admits exactly two tight contact structures extending this boundary condition. We can decompose M as $(M \setminus V_3) \cup V_3$ where $M \setminus V_3$ is made of V_1, V_2 and a neighborhood of the annulus $\mathcal{A}$. As

the dividing set of $\mathcal{A}$ uniquely determines a tight contact structure in the neighborhood of $\mathcal{A}$, and V_1, V_2 each carries a unique tight contact structure, we infer that $M \setminus V_3$ has unique tight contact structure relative to its boundary $\partial(M \setminus V_3) = \partial V_3$. On the other hand, as explained above V_3 has two tight contact structures satisfying the same boundary condition. So, M has at most two tight contact structures.

□

3. Proof of Theorem 1.3

We assume that X is a smooth, oriented, acyclic 4-manifold with $\partial X = \Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$. It follows from Theorem 1.6 that $-X$ does not admit a Stein structure, or even a symplectic structure that weakly fills its boundary (we will refer to such a symplectic structure as *weakly convex*). To show X cannot be Stein with its given orientation either, we begin by noting that $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ is the oriented boundary of the negative-definite, non-minimal plumbing of disk bundles over spheres described by the graph in Figure 3. This plumbing, which we denote by P, is diffeomorphic to a blowup of the minimal resolution of the Brieskorn singularity $x^2 + y^3 + z^{12n+1} = 0$, and moreover P admits a symplectic structure with the property that the core spheres are symplectic and orthogonal, and such that any neighborhood of the union of core spheres contains a (strongly) symplectically convex neighborhood (c.f. [12, Theorem 1.2]). In particular, ∂P admits a natural tight contact structure. By standard neighborhood theorems in symplectic topology, it follows that if a collection of spheres is found embedded in a symplectic 4-manifold, intersecting ω-orthogonally according to the graph in Figure 3, this configuration of spheres admits a strongly convex neighborhood symplectomorphic to P. We now exhibit such an embedding of spheres.

Begin with the elliptic surface $E(2)$ equipped with a standard (Kähler) symplectic form and an elliptic fibration without multiple fibers, and recall that $E(2)$ has trivial canonical class. We can assume the fibration contains a section S, which is in particular a symplectically embedded sphere of square -2, and also a cusp fiber F. Blow up the cusp three times to resolve the singularity; then the proper transform $\tilde{F}$ is an embedded symplectic sphere of square -6, and if the exceptional classes corresponding to the blowups are e_1, e_2, e_3 then the homology class of this sphere is $F - 2e_1 - e_2 - e_3$. Blow up the intersection point between $\tilde{F}$ and the section S, then repeatedly blow up the intersection between the resulting exceptional sphere e_4 and the proper transform of S to obtain a configuration as in Figure 4, containing a symplectic copy of the plumbing P. Counting blowups, we find that the configuration lies in the manifold $M = E(2)\#(2n+3)\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$. The homology classes of the curves in the configuration are shown in Figure 4.



FIGURE 3. A plumbing P with boundary $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$.



FIGURE 4. Blowing up to obtain P in a closed manifold. Embedded symplectic spheres are represented by line segments, labeled by their homology classes. Spheres in P are shown in bold.

The canonical class is the only basic class of $E(2)$: by a *basic class*, we mean a characteristic element of H^2 whose associated Ozsváth-Szabó invariant Φ is nontrivial. Strictly, we identify characteristic cohomology classes with spin^c structures via the first Chern class; since all 4-manifolds we consider have vanishing first homology there is no ambiguity in this identification. Furthermore, it suffices for us to consider the Ozsváth-Szabó invariant as a function on characteristic cohomology classes with values in $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. The claim about basic classes for $E(2)$ was proved in [25]. More generally, it was shown in [25] that the canonical class of any closed symplectic 4-manifold with $b^+ > 1$ is a basic class.

Now suppose the acyclic manifold X admits a weakly convex symplectic structure. Since ∂X is a homology sphere a weak filling can be deformed to be strongly convex (see [7, Proposition 4.1], for example), so we assume this to have been done. The corresponding contact structure on $\partial X = \Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)$ is tight, and therefore by Theorem 1.7 is contactomorphic to the contact structure on ∂P. Since the latter is also convex, the symplectic structures on X and P can be arranged to be symplectomorphic in neighborhoods of the boundaries, and hence the smooth manifold $Y = (M - P) \cup_\partial X$ admits a symplectic structure that agrees with that of M away from the surgery region (the choice of contactomorphism used to identify the boundaries is immaterial). In particular, the canonical class of Y has $K_Y|_{Y-X} = K_M|_{M-P}$. Furthermore, since the intersection form of P is negative definite, we have $b^+(Y) = b^+(M) = 3$. Thus by Ozsváth and Szabó's nonvanishing result, if X admits a weakly convex symplectic structure then Y has a basic class (the canonical class) whose restriction to $Y - X$ agrees with the restriction of the canonical class of M on the complement of P. The required contradiction follows from:

Theorem 3.1. *If $c \in H^2(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ is a characteristic element with $c|_{Y-X} = K_M|_{M-P}$, then the Ozsváth-Szabó invariant $\Phi(c)$ is trivial.*

To begin the proof, recall that the Ozsváth-Szabó invariant Φ is defined using the TQFT structure of Heegaard Floer homology. In particular, we can find an admissible cut for Y

away from X, and then since ∂X is a homology sphere we have

$$\Phi(c) = F^+_{X,c} \circ F^{mix}_{Y-X,c}(\Theta^-).$$

Here Θ^- denotes a generator in top degree of $HF^-(S^3)$ (where S^3 is the boundary of a 4-ball cut out of $Y - X$), and implicitly in the expression above we are taking the part lying in degree 0. Note that $\partial(Y - X) = -\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)$, so we are interested in the action of the map $F^+_{X,c}$ on the *relative invariant* v of $Y - X$: by definition this is the element

$$v = F^{mix}_{Y-X,K}(\Theta^-) \in HF^+(-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)),$$

where $K = c|_{Y-X}$ is the canonical class of $Y - X = M - P$.

Now, $F^+_{X,c}$ is a linear map $HF^+(-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)) \to \mathbb{F} = HF^+_0(S^3)$, where $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is our coefficient ring, and can be nonzero only in the lowest degree $HF^+_0(-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1))$ by the degree shift formula in Heegaard Floer theory.

Lemma 3.2. *The Heegaard Floer homology of $-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)$ is given as an $\mathbb{F}[U]$ module by*

$$HF^+(-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)) = \mathcal{T}^+_0 \oplus \mathbb{F}^{2n},$$

where $\mathcal{T}^+_0 = \mathbb{F}[U, U^{-1}]/U \cdot \mathbb{F}[U]$, graded such that U has degree -2 and the lowest nontrivial grading of $\mathcal{T}^+_0$ is 0, and where $\mathbb{F}^{2n}$ is in degree 0 with vanishing action by U.

Proof. We saw previously that $\Sigma(2, 3, 12n+1)$ is diffeomorphic to the result of $-\frac{1}{2n}$ surgery on the right-handed trefoil knot. The corresponding Floer homology was calculated by Ozsváth and Szabó in [23, Section 8.1], and the lemma follows by reversing orientation. □

In particular, we see that the kernel of the action of U on $HF^+(-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1))$ is $\ker(U) = HF^+_0(-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)) \cong \mathbb{F}^{2n+1}$, and we are interested in the vector $F^+_{X,c} \in (\ker(U))^*$. A description of this dual space was given by Ozsváth and Szabó [24], where Heegaard Floer homology of boundaries of negative-definite plumbings is considered in more generality. The essential points for our purposes are as follows.

We consider a negative definite plumbing P as a cobordism from $-\partial P \to S^3$ by removing a ball from the interior. Identifying spin^c structures on P with the set $Char(P) \subset H^2(P; \mathbb{Z})$ of characteristic cohomology classes, we obtain a function

$$\Theta : Char(P) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}[U]}(HF^+(-\partial P), \mathcal{T}^+_0)$$

that sends a pair $(K, \ell) \in Char(P) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ to the induced map $U^\ell F^+_{P,K}$. This function is usually many-to-one, as follows from the *adjunction relation*. To state this, assume $S \subset P$ is an embedded sphere, and suppose

$$\langle K, S\rangle + S.S = 2n.$$

If $n \geq 0$ the adjunction relation says

$$U^n F_{K+2PD(S)} = F_K,$$

while if $n \leq 0$ then

$$F_{K+2PD(S)} = U^{-n} F_K$$

(see [24, 25]). Use analogous formulas to define an equivalence relation on $Char(P) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, so that

$$(K, \ell) \sim (K + 2PD(S), \ell + n) \quad \text{or} \quad (K, \ell - n) \sim (K + 2PD(S), \ell)$$

if $n \geq 0$ or $n \leq 0$, respectively, and where S varies over the spheres corresponding to vertices of the plumbing graph. Ozsvth and Szabó prove in [24] that the collection of those equivalence classes containing only pairs of the form $(K, 0)$ corresponds, via Θ followed by the projection to degree zero in $\mathcal{T}_0^+$, to a basis for $(\ker U)^*$. We write $\mathbb{K}$ for the set of equivalence classes in $Char(P) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ under this equivalence.

As an example in our situation, consider the characteristic class on the plumbing P of Figure 3 described by the vector $K_1 = (-1, 0, 1, -3, 0, \dots, 0)$, whose entries are the values $\langle K_1, S_j \rangle$ for the vertex spheres S_j as in Figure 3. Since $\langle K_1, S_3 \rangle + S_3.S_3 = 0$, we have $(K_1, 0) \sim (K_2, 0)$ where $K_2 = K_1 + 2PD(S_3) = (1, 2, -1, -1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Now we see $\langle K_2, S_2 \rangle + S_2.S_2 = 0$, so we can add $2PD(S_2)$ to K_2 to obtain another member of the equivalence class. Continuing in this manner gives a sequence of characteristic vectors (a "full path" in the terminology of [24])

$$K_1 = (-1, 0, 1, -3, 0, \dots, 0), \quad K_2 = (1, 2, -1, -1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad K_3 = (1, -2, 1, -1, 0, \dots, 0),$$
$$K_4 = (3, 0, -1, 1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad K_5 = (-3, 0, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0), \quad K_6 = (-1, 2, -1, 3, 0, \dots, 0),$$
$$K_7 = (-1, -2, 1, 3, 0, \dots, 0), \quad K_8 = (1, 0, -1, 5, 0, \dots, 0)$$

such that $\{(K_i, 0)\}_{i=1}^8$ exhausts an equivalence class in $\mathbb{K}$. By construction, all these vectors induce the same (nonzero) map $HF_0^+(-\Sigma(2, 3, 12n + 1)) \to HF_0^+(S^3) = \mathbb{F}$, which is a basis vector in $(\ker U)^*$. Observe that the vector K_8, which satisfies the adjunction formula $\langle K_8, S_j \rangle + S_j.S_j = -2$ for each j, corresponds to the canonical class K_P.

The conjugate $\bar{K}_P$ of the canonical class belongs to a different equivalence class, obtained from the one above by negating all the vectors $K_1, \dots, K_8$. In particular, we see that K_P and $\bar{K}_P$ induce covectors $\kappa, \bar{\kappa} \in (\ker U)^*$ that, together with covectors corresponding to the remaining equivalence classes, form a basis.

Lemma 3.3. *If $c \in H^2(M; \mathbb{Z})$ is a basic class of M whose restriction to the complement of P agrees with that of K_M or its conjugate $\bar{K}_M$, then the restriction of c to P has the form*

$$c|_P = (x, y, z, w, 0, \dots, 0)$$

for integers x, y, z, w.

Proof. The basic classes of $M = E(2)\#(2n + 3)\overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2$ are exactly those classes of the form $c = \sum_{i=1}^{2n+3} \varepsilon_i e_i$, where e_i are the classes Poincaré dual to the exceptional spheres and $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$, as follows from the "blowup formula" of [26, Theorem 1.4] and the fact that the only basic class of $E(2)$ is the zero class. The proper transform $\tilde{S}$ of the section of $E(2)$ lies in the complement of P in M, and is a symplectic sphere of self-intersection $-2n - 2$. If c agrees with K_M away from P, then from the adjunction formula we have $\langle c, \tilde{S} \rangle = 2n$, and from the expression $\tilde{S} = S - \sum_{i=4}^{2n+3} e_i$ it follows easily that $\varepsilon_i = 1$ for $i = 4, \dots, 2n + 3$. Now it is clear that c evaluates trivially on each member of the chain of -2 spheres in P. The rest of the statement follows easily by conjugation. □

Observe that from the proof just given, it follows that the basic classes of M that agree with K_M or $\bar{K}_M$ away from P are exactly those of the form $\sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon_i e_i$. It is straightforward

to check that these sixteen classes, when restricted to P, comprise the two equivalence classes in $\mathbb{K}$ containing $K_1, \dots, K_8$ and their negatives.

Recall that there is an involution on Heegaard Floer homology induced by conjugation of spin^c structures, usually also called conjugation. In our case, since $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$ has just one spin^c structure, we obtain in particular an involution of $\ker U \subset HF^+(-\Sigma(2,3,12n+1))$. The corresponding involution of $(\ker U)^*$ corresponds, via Θ above, to conjugation of spin^c structures on P (c.f. [26, Theorem 3.6]).

Lemma 3.4. *If $\alpha \in (\ker U)^*$ is a conjugation-invariant covector, and $v = F^{mix}_{M-P,K_M}(\Theta^-)$ is the relative invariant of the complement of P with respect to the canonical spin^c structure, then $\alpha(v) = 0$.*

Proof. Since the equivalence classes in $\mathbb{K}$ give rise to a basis of $(\ker U)^*$, we can express α as a linear combination $\alpha = a\kappa + b\bar{\kappa} + \delta$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}$ and δ is in the span of covectors corresponding to equivalence classes not containing the canonical class of P or its conjugate. We claim that $\delta(v) = 0$. Indeed, if $\delta(v) \neq 0$, then we can find a characteristic element $d \in H^2(P;\mathbb{Z})$ with $F^+_{P,d}(v) \neq 0$, such that the corresponding equivalence class in $\mathbb{K}$ contains neither K_P nor $\bar{K}_P$. Then we can construct a basic class on M by gluing the canonical class to d: indeed, if $c = d\#K_{M-P}$ is this class then $F^{mix}_{M-P,c}(\Theta^-) = v$ while $F^+_{P,c}(v) \neq 0$ by assumption. But by the remark above, the only basic classes on M that agree with the canonical class on $M - P$ also restrict to P to give members of the equivalence classes containing K_P and $\bar{K}_P$, contradicting our choice of d. Hence we must have $\delta(v) = 0$.

Now note that by conjugation invariance we must have $a = b$. Moreover, both κ and $\bar{\kappa}$ evaluate nontrivially on v: indeed, $\kappa(v)$ and $\bar{\kappa}(v)$ are just the (nonzero) Ozsváth-Szabó invariants of M in the classes K_M and $\bar{K}_M$. The lemma follows. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. If X is an acyclic manifold with boundary $\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)$, then the unique spin^c structure s on X induces a conjugation-invariant map

$$\ker U \subset HF^+(-\Sigma(2,3,12n+1)) \to HF^+_0(S^3) = \mathbb{F}.$$

Thinking of $F^+_{X,s}$ as a member of $(\ker U)^*$, it follows from the lemma above that $F^+_{X,s}$ evaluates trivially on v. Moreover, any class $c \in H^2(Y;\mathbb{Z})$ as in the statement of the theorem is necessarily of the form $c = s\#K_{M-P}$. Hence $\Phi(c) = F^+_{X,s}(v) = 0$. □

REFERENCES

[1] Selman Akbulut and Robion Kirby. Mazur manifolds. *Michigan Math. J.*, 26(3):259–284, 1979.

[2] Andrew J. Casson and John L. Harer. Some homology lens spaces which bound rational homology balls. *Pacific J. Math.*, 96(1):23–36, 1981.

[3] Clément Caubel, Andras Némethi, and Patrick Popescu-Pampu. Milnor open books and Milnor fillable contact 3-manifolds. *Topology*, 45(3):673–689, 2006.

[4] Fan Ding, Hansjörg Geiges, and András I. Stipsicz. Surgery diagrams for contact 3-manifolds. *Turkish J. Math.*, 28(1):41–74, 2004.

[5] Yakov Eliashberg. Filling by holomorphic discs and its applications. In *Geometry of low-dimensional manifolds, 2 (Durham, 1989)*, volume 151 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 45–67, Cambridge, 1990. Cambridge Univ. Press.

[6] Yakov Eliashberg. Topological characterization of Stein manifolds of dimension > 2. *Internat. J. Math.*, 1(1):29–46, 1990.

[7] Yakov Eliashberg. A few remarks about symplectic filling. *Geom. Topol.*, 8:277–293, 2004.
[8] John B. Etnyre. Introductory lectures on contact geometry. In *Topology and geometry of manifolds (Athens, GA, 2001)*, volume 71 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 81–107. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
[9] John B. Etnyre and Ko Honda. Knots and contact geometry I. Torus knots and the figure eight knot. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 1(1):63–120, 2001.
[10] Henry Clay Fickle. Knots, $\mathbb{Z}$-homology 3-spheres, and contractible 4-manifolds. *Houston J. Math.*, 10(4):467–493, 1984.
[11] Ronald Fintushel and Ronald J. Stern. Pseudofree orbifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 122(2):335–364, 1985.
[12] David T. Gay and András I. Stipsicz. Symplectic surgeries and normal surface singularities. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 9(4):2203–2223, 2009.
[13] Paolo Ghiggini. On tight contact structures with negative maximal twisting number on small Seifert manifolds. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 8(1):381–396, 2008.
[14] Paolo Ghiggini and Stephan Schönenberger. On the classification of tight contact structures. In *Topology and geometry of manifolds (Athens, GA, 2001)*, volume 71 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 121–151, Providence, R.I., 2003. Amer. Math. Soc.
[15] Paolo Ghiggini and Jeremy Van Horn-Morris. Tight contact structures on the Brieskorn spheres $-\Sigma(2,3,6n-1)$ and contact invariants. Preprint `arxiv:0910.2752`.
[16] Emmanuel Giroux. Convexité en topologie de contact. *Math. Helv.*, 66(4):637–677, 1991.
[17] Robert E. Gompf. Handlebody construction of Stein surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 148(2):619–693, 1998.
[18] Robert E. Gompf. Smooth embeddings with Stein surface images. *J. Topol.*, (4):915–944, 2013.
[19] Ko Honda. On the classsification of tight contact structures I. *Geom. Topol.*, 4:309–368, 2000.
[20] Paolo Lisca and Gordana Matić. Tight contact structures and Seiberg-Witten invariants. *Invent. Math.*, 129(3):509–525, 1997.
[21] Ciprian Manolescu. Pin(2)-equivariant Seiberg-Witten Floer homology and the triangulation conjecture. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 29(1):147–176, 2016.
[22] Andras Némethi and Patrick Popescu-Pampu. On the Milnor fibres of cyclic quotient singularities. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 101(2):554–588, 2010.
[23] Peter S. Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó. Absolutely graded Floer homologies and intersection forms for four-manifolds with boundary. *Adv. Math.*, 173(2):179–261, 2003.
[24] Peter S. Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó. On the Floer homology of plumbed three-manifolds. *Geom. Topol.*, 7:185–224, 2003.
[25] Peter S. Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó. Holomorphic triangle invariants and the topology of symplectic four-manifolds. *Duke Math. J.*, 121(1):1–34, 2004.
[26] Peter S. Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó. Holomorphic triangles and invariants for smooth four–manifolds. *Adv. Math.*, 202:326–400, 2006.
[27] Heesang Park, Jongil Park, Dongsoo Shin, and Giancarlo Urzúa. Milnor fibers and symplectic fillings of quotient singularities. Preprint `arxiv:1507.06756`.
[28] Bülent Tosun. Tight small Seifert fibered manifolds with $e_0 = -2$. Preprint `arxiv:1510.06948`.
[29] K. Yasui. Nonexistence of Stein structures on 4-manifolds and maximal Thurston-Bennequin numbers. Preprint `arxiv:1508.01491`.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
E-mail address: `tmark@virginia.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
E-mail address: `bt5t@virginia.edu`